

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM SCOTT HOWARD,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 1:25-1018-STA-jay

**HENDERSON POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.,**

Defendants.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISMISSAL**

On February 4, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed *sua sponte*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff has failed to file any objections. The failure to object to the report releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)). That is, the district court is not required to review — under a de novo or any other standard — “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Id.* Accordingly, a district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the Magistrate Judge to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*; *see also United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981.)

The time for filing objections has passed. Plaintiff has neither objected, nor has he provided a legitimate reason why he failed to do so. Further, upon the Court's independent review of the record, there does not appear to be any error in the report and recommendation. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** it in its entirety. This matter is hereby **DISMISSED** with

prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The Clerk of the Court is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. Thomas Anderson.
United States District Judge

Date: February 25, 2025